

REMARKS

I. Introduction

By the present Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-7, and 10 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-10 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 are independent.

II. Office Action Summary

In the Office Action of April 2, 2010, claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 10 were objected to because of various informalities. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's indication that claims 1-10 would be allowable, if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections set forth under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, is noted with appreciation.

III. Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Regarding this rejection, the Office Action cites various instances of language that was considered indefinite or otherwise unclear. For example, the phrases "by arranging reception echo signals" and "a signed velocity" were considered unclear. The Office Action further indicated that the phrase "on the basis of" should be replaced with --based on--.

By the present Amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to address all instances of indefiniteness raised in the Office Action. Specifically, various claims have been amended to specify that the reception echo-time series signals are arranged in order of the transmission times as components of the Legendre

polynomial. The claims have also been amended to clarify that the velocity signal includes a sign code for distinguishing the transmission direction of the pulse waves. The phrase “on the basis of” has also been replaced with --based on--, as suggested in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Objections to the Claims

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 10 were objected to because of various informalities. Regarding these objections, the Office Action cites various instances of language that was improper or grammatically incorrect. For example, the Office Action cites various instances where components required clarification by specifying that they are configured to perform certain functions.

By the present Amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to address all of the objections raised in the Office Action. Furthermore, as previously discussed, the term “signed velocity signal” has been amended to --velocity signal-- and further clarified.

Withdrawal of these objections is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is believed in order, and courteously solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are any matters which can be resolved by way of either a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

AUTHORIZATION

Applicants request any shortage or excess in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, and for which no other form of payment is offered, be charged or credited to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case: 520.46163X00).

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP.

/Leonid D. Thenor/ 
Leonid D. Thenor
Registration No. 39,397

LDT/vvr
1300 N. Seventeenth Street
Suite 1800
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Tel: 703-312-6600
Fax: 703-312-6666

Dated: July 2, 2010